New York Tribune

PART III EIGHT PAGES — SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 1919 — PART III EIGHT PAGES

New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements

Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 1919.

Owned and published daily by New York Tribune Inc., a New York Corporation. Ogden Reid, President; G. Vernor Rogers, Vice-President; Helen Rogers Reid, Secretary; F. A. Suter, Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone, Beekman 3000.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By Mail, including Postage. IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA:

	One Year.	Six Months.	One Month.
Daily and Sunday	$10.00	$5.00	$1.00
Daily only	8.00	4.00	.75
Sunday only	3.00	1.50	.30
Sunday only, Canada	6.00	3.25	.55

FOREIGN RATES

Daily and Sunday	$26.00	$13.30	$2.40
Daily only	17.40	8.70	1.45
Sunday only	9.75	5.12	.80

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter

GUARANTEE

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for republication of all news dispatches credited to it or not otherwise credited in this paper, and also the local news of spontaneous origin published herein.

Afterthoughts

Senator Hitchcock says he is strongly in favor of compromise—now. Why wasn't he strongly in favor of it when the treaty was before the Senate in committee of the whole and compromise was in order and thoroughly practicable? The Nebraska Senator expresses a regret strangely at odds with his attitude during the long treaty struggle.

What was the main obstacle to an agreement on a form of ratification which could have been supported by sixty-four Senators? Looking back most fair-minded men will agree that it was Mr. Hitchcock or the principal whose agent he was. Nearly every member of the mild reservationist group has testified that the Democratic leader wouldn't discuss compromise with them. He took the stand originally that ratification should be unconditional. He banked on the success of President Wilson's appeal to the nation.

Many Republicans, opposed to sending the treaty back to the peace conference, joined in defeating amendments. These Republicans were also willing to join with Mr. Hitchcock in holding the reservations down to a minimum and giving them a conciliatory tone. With their aid a rejection of the preamble could have been secured. In August, or even in September, he could have formed an alliance with the mild reservationists to control the parliamentary situation and to present a ratification resolution which would have had the support of a majority, perhaps of a two-thirds majority.

But, under orders, he persistently refused to show his hand. What was the limit of concession on the reservation to Article X? Mr. Hitchcock was impenetrable on that point. He finally offered a substitute for the committee reservation which differed from the committee text only in phrasing. But he wouldn't admit that he would vote for ratification if his substitute were accepted.

The position of the minority throughout was elusive. That was due to the fact that Mr. Hitchcock and his followers were not acting on their own responsibility as Senators, but were following instructions from the White House. They were not free agents, qualified as such to go into conference with the Republican mild reservationists. Anything they did on their own account was likely to be countermanded by the President. The mild reservationists were soon made to realize that they couldn't negotiate on even terms with the minority. They could commit themselves definitely on any proposition, but Mr. Hitchcock couldn't. So they turned inevitably to the strong Republican reservationists to effect their compromises. The minority was thus compelled by its own ineffective leadership to take the resolution of ratification as it was perfected or leave it.

Mr. Hitchcock now talks of compromise. But the majority of the friends of the treaty have put themselves clearly on record. The minority has not. It must expect to concede more than it would have had to concede in the earlier stages of the discussions. An agreement need not be despaired of. Yet it can be obtained only if the minority frees itself from dependence on outside judgments. Until the Democratic Senators begin to speak and act for themselves there will be little hope of that union of forces which will make ratification possible.

The Movie as News

The public will see good sense in the decision of the Appellate Division in the Humiston case that a news film does not require the assent of the persons appearing in it to legalize its use. Whether this judgment is clearly in accord with the language of the privacy statute may be open to debate. That it is the sound and wholesome view, having regard to the paramount rights of the public, seems certain.

The news film has become a recognized feature of American life. It is constantly being developed. Unquestionably it is destined to play a large part in the formation of public opinion and knowledge. It is not fairly to be classed with the display of a portrait photograph for advertising or other commercial purposes, in which a person's privacy is violated simply for private gain. The right of privacy is sacred and must be preserved; but it reaches its obvious limits the moment the public's legitimate interest is touched.

To reach any other decision would destroy the public's right to a valuable record of public events. In a democracy the dissemination of facts touching public events is a vital part of the social system. This decision should be upheld and made secure, if need be, by legislative enactment.

Men of Dependence

The Washington correspondent of The Tribune reports a lively effort in progress to choose Senator Underwood instead of Senator Hitchcock as Senate minority leader. The Nebraskan Senator having failed, it is proposed to scrap him.

Not a little sympathy will flow to Senator Hitchcock, for in no true sense does he seem responsible for his failure. He was not allowed to lead. He was required to keep in close personal and telephonic communication with the White House. He could decide nothing, not even small details. As often as a proposal was submitted to him, he was expected to say nothing—merely to report it and to report back the dictated answer. On many occasions he was teased by those in nominal conference assuming he was a free agent.

Such a humiliating rôle should not have been accepted. The Senator degraded himself by consenting to be a rubber stamp. But such were the conditions imposed. Senator Martin, the late Democratic leader, when he realized he had no function, refused to be minimized and practically quit, although shrinking from open insurrection. Senator Underwood, however great his amiability and ability, will do scarcely better than Senator Hitchcock, unless resolved to be a man and not a dummy. "Men of independent minds!" exclaimed Daniel Webster, when eulogizing his colleagues of the Senate. "Men of dependent minds" he would be led to say if he had participated in the recent session.

Europe and the President

Our allies in Europe are said to be amazed and mortified because of the failure of the peace treaty. They accepted President Wilson's fluent assurances at face value. They closed their minds to any suspicion that the President was misinterpreting American sentiment.

Article X of the covenant was the President's personal contribution. It was a paraphrase of an article which he and Mr. Lansing wanted to insert in a treaty with the Latin American republics, substituting a new doctrine of pan-Americanism for the Monroe Doctrine. This article, of American origin, was to be "the heart of the covenant." The Allied governments naturally supposed that American support was pledged to it in advance. They see now that such was not the case. Their disillusionment is bitter.

Most European critics are disposed to vent their disappointment equally on the President and the Senate. But this is not a fair allotment. The Senate did nothing to mislead European opinion. Neither did the nation. The voters rejected Mr. Wilson's appeal for the reëlection of a Democratic Congress. They dissociated themselves from his personal leadership. The round robin of March last was another direct warning that the league of nations compact as framed at Paris was unacceptable to more than one-third of the Senate's membership.

The Senate and the country had no real voice in the deliberations at Paris. The Allied statesmen, accepting a situation which could not have developed under the forms of government to which they are accustomed, put complete faith in Mr. Wilson's representative quality. They were deceived. If any one in this country owes them apology and reparation it is the President. He prevented them from making a peace which would have better secured their own interests. They staked much on their agreements with him. They have now a valid moral claim against him. To meet it he must do his best to save what can be saved from the wreckage.

If the Allied powers of Europe prefer the treaty as modified in the Senate to no treaty at all, their wishes should constitute a command to Mr. Wilson. He owes it to them to keep the United States inside the league, if they want us to remain in it on the basis established by the Senate's reservations. It is to their interest to retain the United States as a partner in the German settlement. It is his corresponding duty to facilitate by reasonable concessions our entry into that partnership.

1620—1920

"Out of small beginnings great things have been produced, and as one small candle may light a thousand, so the light here kindled hath shone to many." So wrote Governor William Bradford of the landing of 102 men, women and children on Massachusetts Bay in 1620, by which we commonly date the beginnings of our America. Next year will mark the passage of three centuries since that small adventure, so prophetically described by its leader. Already plans are in hand for an elaborate celebration of the year; and it is of especial interest to find in *The Contemporary Review* an account of what England is proposing to do in honor of the occasion.

The Anglo-American Society, of which the Duke of Connaught is president, has charge of the arrangements, working in coöperation with the Mayflower committee of the Free Church Council and the Sulgrave Institution of America. An elaborate program of educational lectures is planned for the coming winter. In May and June it is expected that a representative American delegation will visit England to partake in commemorative exercises at Scrooby (where William Brewster lived), Austerfield, Boston, Cambridge and other English places connected with the origin of the Pilgrim movement. A visit to Holland on the invitation of the Leyden committee will follow, covering the ground touched by the Pilgrims during their twelve years' residence in the Netherlands, from 1608 to 1620. The sailing of the Mayflower will be commemorated at Southampton and Plymouth, and on September 16, the date of the final departure from Plymouth, the British delegates, with their American and Dutch colleagues, will sail for Boston.

It is thus in the latter part of next year—it was on November 19 that Cape Cod was sighted, after a nine weeks' voyage—that the great occasions will naturally take place in this country. There have been historic celebrations of the Pilgrim landing before in America. But we are confident the coming anniversary will surpass them all in moving appeal. It will be a pleasure to unite with Britons in joint praise of these typically Anglo-Saxon ancestors of ours who lit the small candle of 1620. Further, the nation will wish to pay devoted homage to that typical beginning of America which has for three hundred years maintained at its heart of hearts the pioneer courage and tradition.

Lord Weardale, writing of the tercentenary, quotes from John Masefield a passage deserving every American's reading. The words are from an introduction to the "Chronicles of the Pilgrim Fathers" in the Everyman's Library:

> "A generation fond of pleasure, disinclined toward serious thought and shrinking from hardship will find it difficult to imagine the temper, courage and manliness of the emigrants who made the first Christian settlement of New England. For a man to give up all things and fare forth into savagery in order to escape from the responsibilities of life—in order, that is, to serve the devil, 'whose feet are bound by civilization'—is common. Giving up all things in order to serve God is a sternness for which prosperity has unfitted us. . . . For all the Mayflower's sailing, there is, perhaps, little existing in modern England or America, according to the 'Primitive Pattern in the Word of God.' It would be healthful could either country see herself through the eyes of those pioneers, or see the pioneers as they were. . . . They were plain men of moderate abilities, who, giving up all things, went to live in the wilds, at unknown cost to themselves, in order to preserve to their children a life in the soul."

Renewed respect for the Pilgrim spirit, for old America, has been one outgrowth of the war. And there is also on which to build in this country a factor which Mr. Masefield does not take up—the fresh and renewing waves of pioneering which each generation, from 1620 to 1920, have participated in. Much of the country may have grown soft in temper and courage. The frontier ever pushing westward, has kept alive something of the Pilgrim soul in our strongest and best. Yet the warning of Mr. Masefield is deserved and pointed. We need in 1920 as never before the spirit of 1620. May our coming memorials signal its rebirth and prophesy its regained leadership.

The Old Story

(From The Philadelphia Inquirer)

The periodical movement looking toward the deportation of Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman is again under way, and, following the usual precedents, we presume that for the next six months or so the Committee on Bouncing will report "progress," and then the whole proposition will relapse into its natural state of innocuous desuetude.

A FAIRY TALE THAT HAS YET TO COME TRUE

"Ma, here's your coal!"

—From *The Cleveland Plain-Dealer.*

The Case of the Coal Miners

Statement of Their Side of the Wage Controversy and a Declaration of Their Americanism

By Ellis Searles, Editor "The United Mine Workers Journal"

Much has been heard about enormous wages earned by coal miners, and much of what has been heard on this subject is wholly without foundation. The fact is, the coal miners of this country are among the poorest paid of any industry, when we take into consideration their average earnings. There is no other fair basis upon which to reckon a man's earnings than his average annual income. While he may earn exceptional wages for one brief period of time, this cannot be accepted as a standard, for there are other times when his earnings are much less, and sometimes he earns nothing at all. The miner's family must live throughout the year. It cannot subsist a part of the time only. Therefore, the average annual earnings of the miner afford the only basis for determining whether he is well paid or poorly paid.

The Central Field

The largest soft coal producing field in the world is found in what is known to the trade as the Central Competitive Field of the United States. This is composed of Western Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana and Illinois. In this field alone the average annual output of soft coal is approximately 200,000,000 tons.

Statistics and figures gathered and compiled by official sources, including the government and the states, show that in the central competitive field the average annual wage of mine workers for the six years from 1913 to 1918, inclusive, was $873.85. By states the average wage of mine workers for each of the years mentioned was as follows:

	1913.	1914.	1915.	1916.	1917.	1918.
Ohio	706.32	405.00	528.24	771.18	$58.90	1,564.16
Indiana	706.38	630.00	671.78	732.98	903.89	1,516.41
W. Penn.	866.90	776.25	781.20	895.70	1,026.59	1,585.40
Illinois	704.68	645.82	671.78	775.00	994.65	1,390.38

1918 a Big Year

It will be noted that the above figures included the year 1918, in which the output of coal was the largest in the history of the coal industry. The total output of soft coal for 1918 was 579,386,000 tons. The Great War was in progress at that time, and the demand for coal with which to win that war was greater than ever before, but the miners met every demand. Not only did they do that, but they piled up a surplus of 80,000,000 tons above what was required by the industries which manufactured war material and supplies. Naturally, in order to do this, the miners worked a greater number of days than ever before, and this fact accounts for the large increase in their average annual income for that year. But even by taking this unusual year into account, the average earnings for the six-year period named were only $875.85, or less than $75 a month. These figures, obtained from official sources, must be taken as being correct, and they cannot be disputed successfully. They should be a complete answer to the statement that miners earn enormous wages. It is true that some miners earned more than $873.85 a year, but it is also true that many thousands of them earned much less than that.

The public has been led by propaganda also to believe that the coal miners have enjoyed excessive increases in their wages in the last few years, and that their demand for an increase at this time is therefore unjustified. It is true that the wages of mine workers have been increased, but it is also true that this increase has not kept pace with the increase in the cost of living. In the 1916 contract with the operators the miners were given 64 cents a ton for picked mining, 52 cents for machine mining, and $2.98 a day for day labor. The average selling price of coal at the mines was $1.25 a ton. By mutual agreement wages were increased in August, 1917. On October 6, 1917, the so-called "Washington Agreement" was effected. Including the voluntary increase in August, this agreement brought the 64-cent rate up to 84 cents, the 52-cent rate up to 72 cents, and the $2.98 rate up to $5.

The Average Increase

The picked miners represent 33 per cent of all men engaged in mine work. Their wage increase was 29 per cent. Machine miners comprise 40 per cent of the total force, and their wage was increased 38 per cent. Day labor constitutes 27 per cent of the total number of men, and their wage raise was 68 per cent. Forty-four per cent was the average increase.

Upon the widespread unemployment shown by the figures given above, the miners base their claim for a shorter workday, in order that the possible amount of working time may be divided evenly throughout all districts and mines throughout the year. But there is another reason why the length of the workday should be reduced. Coal miners work far underground. They must encounter and endure contact with poisonous gases and other conditions that are detrimental to their health and safety. They must live and work under artificial ventilation, which in many instances is practically no ventilation at all. They are in constant danger of falling coal and rock and of being crushed to death. Fires and explosions constantly take their toll of human life in the coal mines, as is shown by the records of coal mine fatalities compiled and published by the United States Bureau of Mines. They are shut off from sunshine and fresh air. Under these conditions men cannot work continuously as many hours as can those who are employed above ground. These conditions sap their vitality and their strength and make them less fit for continuous service. Eight hours a day is too long for a man to work underground, and under these conditions, if he expects to retain his strength and his efficiency as a workman. We contend that the man who works six hours underground to-day will be better able to work to-morrow than will the man who works eight or ten or twelve hours underground to-day.

For a long time past the charge has been frequently made that the United Mine Workers of America are under the control of the extreme radical element, and that they border closely upon Bolshevism and anarchy. Nothing could be further from the truth than this un-American allegation. Throughout all the years of its history the miners' union has been conservative, and has been so regarded by labor everywhere. Bolshevism and extreme radicalism have received no encouragement from the miners' union. On the other hand, these "Red" doctrines have been the subject of frequent and continuous denunciation and opposition by the union. In fact, there is a clause in the constitution of the United Mine Workers of America which makes it impossible for a man to be a member of the union and at the same time hold membership in the I. W. W., the One Big Union, or any other so-called labor organization that is not affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

5 Per Cent Radical

It is true there are men in the United Mine Workers of America who hold extreme radical views and beliefs, but they are a very small minority of the total membership. It is entirely safe to estimate that this class does not represent more than 5 per cent of the membership. There are at this time more than 500,000 members of the United Mine Workers of America.

It is only necessary to point out one instance of recent date to show the attitude of the union toward this extreme radicalism. An outlaw organization, known as the One Big Union, obtained a foothold in parts of our Northwest and across the line in Western Canada. Coal miners of Alberta and British Columbia were members of the United Mine Workers of America, and they formed a district known as District 18 of the union. It was discovered several months ago that the district officials of District 18 of the United Mine Workers of America were members also of the One Big Union, and that many of the rank and file of the members also had joined that outlaw organization. The union made a thorough investigation, and when it had conclusive proof of this situation the international officers summarily revoked the charter of District 18 and threw it out of the union. By this act the international officials took away from the miners of Alberta and Western Canada their membership in the union. It was a bold stroke, but it was strictly in accordance with the provisions of the constitution. The officials held that these men could not retain their membership in the union and in the One Big Union at the same time.

Patriotic Miners

If there had been the domination of the United Mine Workers by the "Red" element, as has been frequently charged, it is not at all consistent to believe that the international officials would have taken this drastic action.

During the Great War the coal miners of this country were outclassed by no other set of men in their patriotism and their loyal devotion to the government. They worked harder than ever before to produce coal with which to win the war. They bought more than $10,000,000 of Liberty bonds and war savings stamps out of their meager earnings to help Uncle Sam pay his war bills. They contributed hundreds of thousands of dollars to the Red Cross, the Y. M. C. A., the Knights of Columbus, the Salvation Army, and all other war relief funds and agencies. In every possible way they showed their loyalty and did their bit, the same as all other good Americans. It is unjust, therefore, to charge them with being in sympathy with, or lending any encouragement to, the dangerous "Red" propaganda and movement which now threatens and for a long time past has threatened the peace and safety of this country.

All that the coal miners ask and all that they have a right to expect, is a square deal. They believe the great American public wishes to be right and to do the right thing, when the public knows what the right thing is.

Unredeemed?

Head of the Anti-Saloon League Rises to Explain

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In view of the calls from newspaper offices evidently either the newspaper folk of New York City are more assiduous readers of religious news than had been suspected or else somebody has called their attention to a note in the religious column of "The Globe" of last Saturday in which reference is made to one "William H. Anderson," among others, being "a convert of McAuley Mission" and having been redeemed from "a life of sin."

In the light of the lurid, even though fictitious, penitentiary record which the "wets" fabricated and have been threatening to spring on me for, lo, these many years, redemption from anything is highly respectable. And since reading some of the New York newspapers I have almost been led to doubt whether I have yet been "redeemed from sin." Much alleged expert testimony in support of this doubt can be produced from among the thirsty or greedy.

I was received into full membership in the Methodist Episcopal Church at the age of eleven at Carlinville, Ill., where I was born and where I lived until entering the Anti-Saloon League work. I have been fairly active in some phase of church activity ever since. I am profoundly thankful for the work done by McAuley Mission and similar institutions, and for twenty years I have been working to increase the efficiency of such institutions by trying to do work that would increase their efficiency by giving them "a shorter haul" in lifting up fallen men.

As I have encountered once or twice a "William H. Anderson" who was engaged in selling liquor, this unlooked-for publicity was indeed kind in having run me through a gospel mill and started me on the upward path, and here's hoping that the "William H. Anderson" really referred to in the religious notice in question suffers no more serious consequences from the confusion incident to the similarity of name.

WILLIAM H. ANDERSON,
Superintendent of Anti-Saloon League of New York.
New York, Nov. 18, 1919.

The Powder Girl

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Can you tell me if the American Legion will give membership to girl munition plant workers and, if they do, where I can apply for membership?

In the fall of 1918 I decided not to return for my second year at college but to keep at work at the munition plant where I had been making cannon powder, pistol powder and doing some inspection work until the armistice. Three days after the armistice was signed I left the plant.

I had never worked before, and I entered the du Pont plant at Haskell, N. J., from a real desire to pull hard with those who were going overseas. We were told that we girls who were taking men's positions and doing men's hard, manual labor, in order to release these for other service, were in the third line of defense; that we were in the S O S on this side, and that we were a necessary part in the "program of winning the war." We worked verey hard—that is, those of us who went in for the service of it. Oftentimes, sixteen hours or a "double" shift gave us a little extra chance to help. I have known girls to work sixteen hours every day for weeks at a stretch in ether, in constant danger of their lives from explosions and fire.

Since I left the plant I have heard "wild" tales about the way we were paid and yet those of us who were the best paid girls in the plant, the forewomen and the inspectors, received very little more than an "everyday" office worker—and, remember, we were taking our lives in our hands because such work, as we were warned when we entered the plant, was "hazardous."

When other war workers are receiving recognition for their service from the Legion, I think that those among the women munition workers who served as I did, making powder, and who have a real desire to enter the Legion in order to pull as hard in peace for the ideals we pulled together for in war, should be allowed to become members in this organization. M. W.

Mountain Lakes, N. J., Nov. 15, 1919.

A Week of Verse

The Polish Mother

(Translation from Mickiewicz)

(From The New Witness)

STAY not, son, 'neath the summer skies
Where the day is bright.
Come, I will show thee where thou must be,
In the caves of night. . . .

There in the darkness thy couch is spread
In the dungeon's gloom—
There must thou think of thy country's dead
And the tyrants' doom,

Let not the anger within thee rise
To thy lips to-day,
Subtly thy thoughts in thy speech disguise
And thy hands delay.

Christ in the workshop of Nazareth
Played wtih the cross
Here be the signs of thy people's death
And thy country's loss.

Chains! for thy hands must wear a chain
In the days to come—
In the long days when thy country's pain
On thy lips is dumb.

Not like knight on a stricken field
Shalt thou come to die;
Laid to rest on thy battered shield,
Where thy fathers lie.

Done to death by a hireling spy
For a crime unknown;
From prison shade shalt thou rise on high
To our father's throne.

No tall column shall mark thy rest
But the gallows tree;
So fares it ever with Poland's best—
So shall fare with thee.

No sweet singer shall tell thy praise;
But a tale oft told
Shall keep thy name till the coming days
Have their fame unrolled.

Till sounds the call of our Poland's drums
'Neath the waking skies,
Till the night is past and the morning comes
And the sleepers rise.

H. E. KENNEDY.

Of a Dead Comrade

(From The English Review)

Smyrna, November, 1918.

I

COMRADE! . . . A dirge of rain.
The sky a shroud.
Pale autumn smoldering along the hills,
And flickering in the woods of sycamore.
Gray ships. The gray Ægean, singing loud
A requiem along the lonely shore.

A morning when the hospital instills
A sadness in the misty, sodden air.
An omen in the breakers' hollow roar,
Tragedy in your mute shape lying there. . . .

II

Over your body, comrade, they have set
A nation's flag to mark a nation's debt;
And we who tend your passing, stretcher-borne,
Along these autumn avenues, forlorn,
Set at your resting place, to voice our loss,
A tribute, and a cross.

III

Comrade! Beyond a far ship's lifting bow,
Beyond the many homing ships that ride
The famed Ægean, flaunting England's pride,
Autumn is flaming in our England now.

Comrade! Of all the homing ships we view,
There is no ship on all the sea for you.

Even so. . . . Anon, anon a ship departs
That leaves your grave untended on the hill,
But it shall bear you with us in our hearts;
Memory of you shall journey with us still;
We shall remember, seeing England's shore,
One who may see his England nevermore.

TREVOR ALLEN.

A Sonnet

(From The English Review)

THE Prince of Darkness, as I understand,
Is a most affable, complacent prince:
His words that soothe, his theses that convince,
Are like a green shade in a thirsty land.
At the crossroads he takes you by the hand:
He cannot bear to watch you shiver and wince
Between the painful and the pleasant—since
The pleasant is the path himself has planned.

In the cold hour when we no longer care
Whether our souls be saved or damned, we strain
And agonize in impotence of prayer,
Not for the saint's, not for the angel's station,
But for the strength, the strength to choose again—
To see salvation and to choose damnation.

GERALD GOULD